



Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners

Office of the Commission Auditor

Legislative Analysis

Regional Transportation Committee

Thursday, March 10, 2005

9:30 AM

Commission Chamber

Charles Anderson, CPA
Commission Auditor

111 NW First Street, Suite 250
Miami, Florida 33128
305-375-4354

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS

ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 99-138; TO INCREASE TRANSIT FARES, RATES AND CHARGES

Dr. Barbara Carey-Shuler

I. SUMMARY

This ordinance proposes to increase the basic adult transit fare for a one-way trip on Metrobus and Metrorail by .35 cents from the current rate of \$1.25 to \$1.60. (This represents an increase of 28%). This increase also extends to monthly and longer term passes. There is also an increase to \$2.00 for Metrobus Express / Special Routes.

This increase would become effective April 1, 2005.

THIS ORDINANCE WILL NOT AFFECT THE "GOLDEN PASSPORT PROGRAM".

II. PRESENT SITUATION

The current rate for a basic adult fare was established in 1990 when fares were increased from \$1.00 to \$1.25 (25% increase). SEE COMMENTS

The following chart shows the current basic adult rates for 10 major U.S. Transit Properties:

City	Regular Fare Rate	Transfer	Senior/Special Discounted Fare
Atlanta	\$ 1.75	N/A	\$ 0.85
Charlotte, NC	\$ 1.10 - 2.20*	\$ 0.45-1.70 **	\$ 0.75
Chicago	\$ 1.75	\$ 0.15 up to 0.25	\$ 0.85
Detroit	\$ 1.50	\$ 0.25	Free
District of Columbia	\$ 1.25	Free Up to Two Hours	\$ 0.60
Houston	\$ 1.00	Free	\$ 0.40
Los Angeles	\$ 0.90 - 3.10*	Based on Destination	\$ 0.45 - 1.55*
New York City	\$ 2.00	No Transfers	\$ 1.00
San Diego	\$ 1.00 - 4.00*	Free Up to Two Hours	\$ 1.00
San Francisco	\$ 1.25	Free Up to Two Hours	\$ 0.35 or \$10 monthly pass
Miami-Dade	\$ 1.25	25**	Free

*Prices contingent upon destination

** Depends on type of transfer: Bus to Rail; Rail to Bus

N/A: Information not available

***The Average adult fare for the 10 cities listed above is \$1.67

March 10, 2005

III. POLICY CHANGE AND IMPLICATION

This amendment further provides that any future rate changes may be effectuated through a resolution in accordance with Sec. 2-150 of the Code of Miami-Dade County.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Based on anticipated ridership numbers, the department estimates that MDT will realize an increase in Fare Box generated revenues of approximately \$30 million.

Price Elasticity

However, it is impossible to accurately gauge the exact impact an increase in fares will have on ridership.

The accepted calculation transit planners use for modeling purposes in North America, based on a number of case studies, is that for every 10 percent increase in fares, the transit authority will experience a decrease in transit usage of approximately 3-4 percent.

Utilizing this theory, a fare increase of 28%, as proposed in this item, would result in an initial decrease in ridership of between 8.4 – 11.2%.

However, the extent of the decrease in ridership is believed to be temporary.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Increases in cost of some consumer products between 1990 and 2004:

Consumer Item	1990	2004	% Increase
Cost of a first-class stamp:	\$0.25	\$0.37	48%
Cost of a gallon of regular gas:	\$1.16	\$1.94	67%
Cost of a dozen eggs:	\$1.00	\$1.31	31%
Cost of a gallon of Milk:	\$2.78	\$3.50	26%

Communities that have recently implemented "Basic Fare Increases":

Community	Year of Increase	Old Fare	New Fare
Washington D.C.	2004	\$1.20	\$1.35
Chicago	2004	\$1.50	\$1.75
New York, NY.	2004	\$1.50	\$2.00

LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS

RESOLUTION APPROVING SIXTH AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL AERONAUTICAL SERVICES PERMITS ("GASP") AT MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Aviation Department

I. SUMMARY

This proposed resolution would approve the Sixth Amendment to the Aviation Department's General Aeronautical Services Permits (GASP) at Miami International Airport. This amendment modifies the GASP payment process and extends the existing permits for a six month period that ends October 31, 2005. This amendment would also approve the Aviation Department's request for a waiver of competitive bid(s).

II. PRESENT SITUATION

There are currently five companies operating at Miami International Airport (MIA) with General Aeronautical Services Permit(s). The permits have been in place since November 1, 1992 and they will expire on April 30, 2005.

On December 21, 2004, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued by the Aviation Department for replacement General Aeronautical Services Permits. American Sales & Management, Swissport USA, Inc., ASIG Miami, Inc., Globe Ground North America LLC d/b/a/ Servisair/Globeground, and Worldwide Flight Services (Worldwide), Inc. have been identified as the five tentative award winners that would be recommended for consideration by the Board of County Commissioners. The interested companies were advised that an executed permit and other required documentation were to be submitted by a time certain date during January 2005. All the tentative award winning companies (listed above) complied with the Aviation Departments additional requests except for ASIG Miami, Inc.

The Aviation Department has made several attempts to contact the local and corporate offices of ASIG to determine and confirm their intent to proceed with this GASP opportunity at MIA. ASIG has failed to respond to both written and oral communication. On January 28, 2005, the Evaluation/Selection Committee requested authorization to proceed to the next ranked responsive and responsible proposer. On February 14, 2005, ASIG notified MDAD by letter and advised them that it would no longer perform ground-handling services at MIA effective April 16, 2005.

III. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- The Aviation Department has requested an extension of six (6) months (in incremental periods of one-month) to allow sufficient time for replacing ASIG with the next ranked responsive and responsible proposer.

RTC ITEM 3(B)

March 10, 2005

- This amendment will extend the validity of the GASP permits until October 31, 2005. The extension will also be beneficial
 - a) for the completion of the award process due to this unexpected non-responsiveness of ASIG,
 - b) to provide additional time if there are any protests, as well as,
 - c) for the ninety (90) calendar day transition period from the existing to the new permittees.
- This resolution will allow the next ranked responsive and responsible proposer, Evergreen Aviation Ground Logistics Enterprises, Inc. (Evergreen) the opportunity to take ASIG's position for the GASP RFP.
- A waiver of competitive bid is also requested by the department to allow Evergreen the opportunity to come in, get acclimated and provide them with a fair opportunity to become a competitive entity at MIA.
 - It has been expressed that Worldwide Flight Services, Inc. (Worldwide) may pull their name out of the tentative award winning list.
 - Triangle Services of Florida, Inc will be the next ranked responsive and responsible proposer if Worldwide's unofficial intentions play out.

IV. ECONOMIC IMPACT

- The GASP agreement(s) with the Aviation department has been modified so the aeronautical service providers pay Miami-Dade County a minimum guaranteed amount instead of the current agreement of 7% of their gross income.

V. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- What monetary amount has the Aviation Department and the respective GASP companies agreed to be the minimum guaranteed payment?
- One incumbent company has expressed their concerns with the Sixth Amendment. Their concerns involve how Evergreen will be brought in to replace ASIG.
- Attachment #1- Evaluation and Selection Process for Request for Proposal (RFP) for General Aeronautical Services

SECTION 4.0 - EVALUATION/SELECTION PROCESS

4.1 PROCESS OVERVIEW

Following the opening of the Proposals, the Proposals will be evaluated by an Evaluation/Selection Committee appointed by the County Manager. It is the responsibility of the Evaluation/Selection Committee to ensure that a Proposal submittal complies with all of the requirements of this RFP and assess it accordingly.

4.2 REVIEW OF PROPOSALS FOR RESPONSIVENESS AND RESPONSIBILITY

Each Proposal will be reviewed to determine if the Proposal is compliant with the submission requirements outlined in the RFP. A responsive Proposal is one which follows the requirements of the RFP, includes all documentation, is submitted in the format outlined in the RFP, is of timely submission, and has the appropriate signatures as required on each document. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in a Proposal being deemed non-responsive by the Office of the County Attorney.

The Evaluation/Selection Committee shall determine if the Proposer meets the minimum qualification requirements, and if the Proposal is responsible. In making these determinations, the Evaluation/Selection Committee shall have the right to investigate the management, operational experience, financial stability, reputation and business judgment of any Proposer and their management, including the conducting of investigations of the officers, directors, principal, stockholders, other principals, if any, of the business entity of the Proposer, its affiliates and parent company and the proposed management, and to review and investigate all contracts the Proposer has performed for the County. The Proposer agrees to provide upon request any additional information that may be required by the Committee or the County. In addition, the Evaluation/Selection Committee reserves the right to inspect the facilities at which the Proposer conducts its business and provides services.

4.3 EVALUATION PROCESS

The Evaluation/Selection Committee will evaluate and rank responsive/responsible Proposals by the criteria listed below. The criteria are itemized with their respective weights for a maximum total of 80 points per each voting Evaluation/Selection Committee member for the Technical Proposal. A Proposer may receive the maximum points or a portion of this score depending on the merit of its Proposal, as judged by the Evaluation/Selection Committee in accordance with the following:

EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points
1	Proposer's Overall Relevant Experience, including Proposer's Industry Reputation	20
2	Proposer's ability to perform the Scope of Services	20
3	Relevant Experience and Knowledge of Proposed General Manager and Other Key Personnel, Human Resources and Programs	10
4	Financial Viability	10
5	Security, Safety, and Quality Assurance Programs	10
6	Proposed equipment, including availability, age, condition and technological state.	10
	Total Technical Proposal Maximum Points	80

PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Price Proposal Maximum Points

20

Total Evaluation Points

100

ORAL PRESENTATIONS

The County may require Proposers to give oral presentations in support of their Proposals and to exhibit or otherwise demonstrate the information contained therein. All individuals must register for oral presentations in accordance with Section 1.18 of these Instructions to Proposers. Upon completion of the oral presentations, the Committee will rate and rank the Proposals based on the Technical Proposal criteria and the oral presentation, if any.

4.5 MINIMUM ANNUAL GUARANTEE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

After the Evaluation/Selection Committee completes the evaluation of the Technical Proposal, it will then evaluate the Price Proposals. The sealed Price Proposal envelopes will be opened in the presence of the Evaluation/Selection Committee.

The Price Proposal submission will be assigned a maximum of 20 points per each voting Evaluation/Selection Committee member.

The Price Proposal will be evaluated in the following manner:

1. The responsive Proposal with the highest total Price Proposal will be given the full weight of twenty (20) points per each voting Evaluation/Selection Committee member assigned to the price proposal criterion.
2. Each Proposal will be given points proportionately in relation to the highest Price

Proposal. This point total will be calculated by dividing the total Price Proposal of the Proposal being evaluated by the highest Price Proposal with the result being multiplied by 20 points.

The application of the above formula will result in uniform assignment of points relative to the criterion price.

Example Price Proposal Evaluation Score per Committee Member

$$\left[\frac{\text{Proposer's Price Proposal}}{\text{Highest proposed Price Proposal}} \right] \times 20$$

The Evaluation/Selection Committee will then determine the overall ranking by adding the Technical Proposal evaluation scores of all voting Evaluation/Selection Committee members with the Price Proposal evaluation scores of all voting Evaluation/Selection Committee members to determine the overall ranking.

Following the evaluation and overall ranking of the Proposals, the Evaluation/Selection Committee will recommend to the County Manager that a contract be awarded to up to five (5) of the highest ranked responsive/responsible Proposers. Upon concurrence of the County Manager, the attached form of Permit will be prepared and submitted to the Board of County Commissioners for approval.

4.6 RECOMMENDATION FOR AWARD

The County will award a contract on the basis of initial offers received, without discussions. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the Proposer's best terms from a monetary and technical standpoint. The contract award, if any, shall be made to the Proposer(s) whose Proposal shall be deemed by the Board of County Commissioners to be in the best interest to the County. The Board of County Commissioners' decision of whether to make the award and which Proposal(s) is in the best interest of the County shall be final.

4.7 CONTRACT AWARD

Prior to the filing of the County Manager's contract award recommendation with the Clerk of the Board, the Successful Proposer(s) shall execute the Permit within five (5) calendar days after such Permit is presented by the County to the Successful Proposer(s).

Failure of the recommended Proposer to execute the Permit as required above may constitute a repudiation of the Respondent's Proposal and result in forfeiture of any deposits and bonds provided pursuant to the RFP. Award then may be recommended and made to the next ranked responsive and responsible Proposer, or all remaining Proposals may be rejected and the RFP may be readvertised.

4.8 EXECUTION OF CONTRACT

Within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of notification of award by the Board of County Commissioners, the Successful Proposer(s) shall deliver to the County all bonds as referenced in Article 3.08 of the Permit and all the insurance requirements as referenced in Article 10 of the Permit.

The Permit shall not be effective until it has been executed by the County and a copy of the fully executed Permit is delivered to the Permittee.

4.9 FAILURE TO PROVIDE PAYMENT GUARANTY AND INSURANCE

Failure by the Proposer to whom the Permit has been awarded to furnish the required Payment Guaranty and evidence of insurance, as referenced in Articles 3.08 and 10 of the Permit respectively, within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of notification of award by the Board of County Commissioners, may result in the annulment of the award and the forfeiture of the Proposal Guaranty to the County, which forfeiture shall be considered not as a penalty but in liquidation of damages sustained by the County. Award then may be made to the next ranked responsive and responsible Proposer, or all remaining Proposals may be rejected and the RFP may be re-advertised.